Attorney Docket No.: Q81016

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116

Application No.: 10/820,788

## REMARKS

Claims 1-11 and 13 are all the claims pending in the application. These claims have been rejected under § 112 (second paragraph) as being indefinite and on prior art grounds. In particular, claims 1 and 3-8 have been rejected under § 102(b) as being anticipated by Cailley, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,761,314). Claims 2 and 9-11 have been rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cailley, et al. and claim 13 has been rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cailley, et al. in view of Ura (EP 1102337A1).

## Rejection under 35 USC § 112 (second paragraph)

The underlying issue in the Office Action relates to the meaning of the term "concertina" as currently used in independent claim 1. Specifically, the Examiner contends that the claims are indefinite because the meaning of this term is unclear. The Examiner gives two interpretations of the term "folded in a concertina manner".

The first one is that the lateral bands are folded in a direction approximately perpendicular to the initial direction of the strips.

The second one is that the lateral bands are folded in a zigzag or accordion like manner.

The Examiner asks which interpretation is correct.

In response, the Applicant submits a definition of the term "concertina" found in the Webster's dictionary. "A concertina is a small musical instrument of the accordion type, with bellows and keys." *See* attached. Thus, it is the Applicant's opinion that "folded in a concertina manner" means that the lateral bands are folded in a zigzag or accordion like manner."

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116

Application No.: 10/820,788

Attorney Docket No.: Q81016

By folding the bands in an accordion like shape, the resulting structure forms a

continuous plane base, which is approximately perpendicular to the initial direction of the strips,

as discussed in the specification. This is shown in Figure 4 of the application. Thus, the

reference in the specification to the continuous plane base which is perpendicular to the initial

direction of the strips does not mean that the lateral bands are folded in a perpendicular manner.

In fact, the description indicates at page 5, lines 3-5 that "the folding of the lateral bands is

carried out by repeated flattening of said bands by small successive passes of a hammer over the

surface." This confirms Applicant's interpretation.

Rejection Under 35 USC § 102:

Neither Cailley nor Ura discloses lateral bands folded in a concertina manner. Indeed,

Cailley and Ura merely disclose lateral bands folded in a substantially perpendicular direction.

Thus, claim 1 is novel over Cailley and Ura.

Rejection Under 35 USC § 103:

The problem of the invention is to avoid any risk of the weld projecting inside the bundle

(p.7 1.25).

The solution of the invention is to fold the lateral bands of the strips of the same polarity

in a sort of "concertina" in order to form a continuous plane base approximately perpendicular to

the initial direction of the strips. The base thus formed constitutes a metal barrier allowing laser-

welding of a plane connection. (page 7 1.16-17). The metal barrier prevents the weld from falling

inside the electrochemical bundle. Further, such a folding provides a "cushion" of material

3

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116

Application No.: 10/820,788

Attorney Docket No.: Q81016

(copper or aluminum) which is thick enough so that the laser beam does not go through the

thickness of the cushion during welding.

None of the cited documents teaches or suggests the solution of the invention. Indeed, the

lateral bands of the strips in both Cailley and Ura are both merely folded perpendicularly to the

direction of the electrochemical bundle and not in a zigzag manner.

Thus, claim 1 would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed

to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is

kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue

Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any

overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian Hannon/

Brian W. Hannon

Registration No. 32,778

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC Telephone: (202) 293-7060

Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 11, 2007

4